

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 12-14, and 16-18 are present in this application. Claims 1, 6, 8, 9, and 14 are independent claims.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 6, 7, 13, and 16-18 are allowed.

**Statement of the Substance of the Interview**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for conducting the interview on August 2, 2007. Applicant believes that as a result of the interview, the Applicant has a better understanding of the Examiner's perspective with regard to the Koefeldt reference, and reasons for the Examiner's suggested language for claims 1 and 14. Applicant believes that the Examiner has a better understanding of the Applicant's claimed invention.

**§ 112, second paragraph, Rejection**

Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, claim 8 has been amended to clarify that the "second supporting member" is adapted to move upwards when accommodating tray is being removed (e.g., Figs. 6-8 showing elevatable table 42 as second supporting member, and support pins 43 as the plurality of supporting members).

Applicant requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**§ 102(b) Rejection – Koefeld**

Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,260,706 (Koefeld). Claims 1, 9, and 14 have been amended. Applicant traverses the rejection based on the claims as amended.

Embodiments covered by claim 1 are directed to a display substrate accommodating tray, comprising:

- a bottom section (e.g., bottom section 11) for mounting a display substrate (e.g., preferably a glass substrate 20 having side length of 1.3 m or greater) thereon;

- a frame (e.g., frame 12);

- a flange-like engaging section (e.g., engaging section 13), protruding externally from walls of said frame in a substantially horizontal fashion, to be engaged by a carrying section for carrying the display substrate accommodating tray; and

- a positional portion (e.g., positioning step 14) provided along a periphery of said frame, the positioning portion for determining the positional relationship between a surface of the walls of said frame of the display substrate accommodating tray and another display substrate accommodating tray which is to be stacked on said surface of said frame.

As can be seen in Fig. 3, engaging section 13 protrudes externally from walls of the frame 12 in a substantially horizontal fashion.

During the subject interview, the Examiner had mentioned that the engaging section of the present invention can be considered as a flange. Applicant has amended claims 1, 9 and 14 to add the adjective “flange-like” to the engaging section in order to better describe the claimed engaging section. Applicant submits that Koefeld fails to teach or suggest at least the claimed element of a flange-like engaging section to be engaged by a carrying section for carrying the display substrate accommodating tray.

The Office Action alleges that Koefeld's central handles 30, projections 32 and recessed portion 39 teaches the claimed engaging section. The Office Action alleges that walls 14, 16, 18, and 20 of Koefeld constitute the claimed frame.

As can be seen in figures 3 and 4 of Koefeld, handles 30 and projections 32 do not protrude externally from walls 14 and/or 16. Furthermore, figures 3 and 4 do not show recessed portion 39 (see Fig. 12) as protruding externally from walls 18 and/or 20. Thus, Applicant submits that central handles 30, projections 32 and/or recessed portion 39 do not protrude externally from walls 14, 16, 18, and 20 in a substantially horizontal fashion, as required by claim 1. This argument applies as well to claims 9 and 14, and respective dependent claims.

At least for the above reasons, Applicant submits that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* anticipation. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### **§ 103(a) Rejection – Koefeld, Akihiro**

Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koefeld in view of JP 11-059893 (Akihiro). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Embodiments covered by claim 8 are directed to a method of removing a display substrate from a display substrate accommodating tray (see Figs. 6 and 7), which among other things includes steps of:

positioning the openings (11a) of the bottom section (11) to be coincident with a position of a plurality of supporting members (43) and

positioning the rest of the bottom section to be coincident with a position of a second supporting member (42), said second supporting member adapted to be pushed downwards by said accommodating tray when said accommodating tray is placed thereupon (e.g. compressing the springs 44), and said second supporting member adapted to move upwards when said accommodating tray is being removed (Fig. 8);

placing said tray onto said second supporting member (Fig. 6), so that said plurality of supporting members move upward relative to the display substrate accommodating tray (e.g., pins 43 extend through openings 11a), thereby inserting the plurality of supporting members into the plurality of openings respectively; and

raising the display substrate above the bottom section by penetrating the plurality of supporting members through the accommodating tray (Fig. 7, display substrate 20 remains at ends of pins 43 while tray 10 is lowered)

Applicant submits that Koefeld and Akihiro, either alone or in combination, fail to teach at least the claimed second support member for supporting a display substrate accommodating tray as the display substrate is raised above the accommodating tray.

Applicant requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**§ 103(a) Rejection – Koefeld, Nakajima**

Claims 5 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koefeld in view of JP 2003-236953 (Nakajima). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant submits that Nakajima fails to make up for the deficiencies in Koefeld. At least for the reasons above for claims 1 and 9, Applicant submits that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness for claims 5 and 12. Applicant requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that claims are allowable.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact **Robert Downs** Reg. No. 48,222 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 12, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert Downs #48222  
Charles Gorenstein  
Registration No.: 29,271  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant